

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 20, and 22-25 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 9-11, and 20 are amended. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to claim 10 for an informality. The Examiner's comment has been addressed in amending the claim 10. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4, and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sasaki et al. (hereinafter "Sasaki"), U.S. Patent No. 5,267,085. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recites, *inter alia*, a driving barrel configured to support a single alignment of at least two lenses configured to serve as a wide-angle lens at all times, wherein the at least two lenses are respectively fixed to a predetermined position of the driving barrel so that an interval between any two lenses in the single alignment of the at least two lenses is immutable, and a moving device comprising a single drive motor configured to reciprocatingly move the driving barrel to perform both focus and zoom operations at the same time. Sasaki does not disclose or suggest at least such features of independent claim 1, or the claimed combination.

That is, Sasaki discloses a first holding frame 10 that holds positive lens group L<sub>1</sub>, a zooming motor M<sub>z</sub> that moves the first holding frame 10, a second holding frame 18 that hold

Amdt. dated August 25, 2009

Reply to Office Action of May 27, 2009

negative lens group L<sub>2</sub>, a focusing motor M<sub>F</sub> that moves the second holding frame 18. The positive lens group L<sub>1</sub> and the negative lens group L<sub>2</sub> are relatively moved forward and backward on a photographing axis O. See, for example, column 5, lines 13-36, and column 5, line 59-column 6, line 10. Therefore, Sasaki does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of wherein the at least two lenses are respectively fixed to a predetermined position of the driving barrel so that an interval between any two lenses in the single alignment of the at least two lenses is immutable, as recited in independent claim 1, or the claimed combination.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Sasaki should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2, 4, and 7-9 are allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 3 and 6 are allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3 and 6 over Sasaki should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Oda et al. (hereinafter “Oda”), U.S. Patent No. 6,850,631. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 10 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Oda

Serial No. 10/747,945  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of May 27, 2009

Docket No. HI-0177

fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching the specific claimed image pickup distance range. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 over Sasaki and Oda should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ohkawara et al. (hereinafter “Ohkawara”), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0135693. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 11 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Ohkawara fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching wherein the position sensor comprises an optical sensor. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 11 over Sasaki and Ohkawara should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Bates et al. (hereinafter “Bates”), U.S. Patent No. 6,930,707. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 12 is allowable over Sasaki at least for the reason discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Bates fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sasaki, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a lens barrel used for an iris recognition camera in an iris recognition system. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 12 over Sasaki and Bates should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 20 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohkawara and Bates, in view of Sasaki. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, thereafter reciprocatingly moving via the moving device comprising the single drive motor the camera lens to perform both focus and zoom operations from the initial position to an image pickup location where a user's iris can be captured, wherein the camera lens includes at least two lenses which are fixed respectively to a predetermined position of a driving barrel so that an interval between any two lenses of the at least two lenses is immutable. Ohkawara, Bates, and Sasaki, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest such features of independent claim 20, or the respective claimed combination.

That is, Ohkawara and Bates, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least such claimed features of independent claim 20. Further, the claimed features of independent claim 20 are similar to the features recited in independent claim 1. As set forth above, Sasaki does not disclose or suggest such features.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 20 over Ohkawara, Bates, and Sasaki should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 22-25 are allowable over Ohkawara, Bates, and Sasaki at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 20, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Serial No. 10/747,945  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of May 27, 2009


Docket No. HI-0177

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP  
  
Carol L. Drubnick  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 CLD:gs/pbxlg  
**Date: August 25, 2009**  
\\\P&A\Documents\2019\2019-180\202844.doc  
**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**